

**SPECIAL DESIGN REVIEW BOARD MEETING
COUNCIL CHAMBERS, RICHMOND CITY HALL**
1401 Marina Way South, Richmond, CA
January 31, 2007
6:00 p.m.

BOARD MEMBERS

Eileen Whitty, Chair
Jonathan Livingston
Don Woodrow
Robert Avellar

Michael Woldemar, Vice Chair
Ted J. Smith
Diane Bloom

The meeting was called to order at 6:05 p.m.

ROLL CALL

Present: Chair Whitty, Vice Chair Woldemar, Board members Avellar, Bloom, Livingston, Smith and Woodrow

Absent: None

INTRODUCTIONS

Staff Present: Lamont Thompson, Richard Mitchell, Hector Rojas and Carlos Privat

MINUTES FOR APPROVAL

ACTION: It was M/S (Woldemar/Woodrow) to accept the minutes of 2/22/06, 3/8/06, 3/22/06 and 4/12/06 unanimously approved.

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Vice Chair Woldemar noted that staff's recommendation for Item 2 was to hold it over until April 25th and recommended it be placed on Consent Calendar.

ACTION: It was M/S (Woldemar/Woodrow) to place Item 2 on the Consent Calendar; unanimously approved.

ACTION: It was M/S (Woldemar/Woodrow) to approve the agenda, as amended; unanimously approved.

CONSENT CALENDAR

Chair Whitty gave an overview of the Consent Calendar, procedures for speaker registration and public hearing functions and procedures. She said any decision approved may be appealed in writing to the City Clerk within ten (10) days by 5:00 p.m.

Chair Whitty noted the Consent Calendar currently consisted of Item 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8 and 9.

Items requested for removal were Items 7 (public), Item 3 (Whitty), Item 5 and 8 (Avellar).

ACTION: It was M/S (Woldemar/Avellar) to approve the Consent Calendar Items 2, 4, 6 and 9; unanimously approved.

Boardmember Woodrow noted Item 2 was reviewed by the PRNC and changed significantly, with the understanding that the owner would come back. The applicant has not returned and Mr. Thompson said staff would request his appearance before the PRNC, but could not require him to appear.

Consent Items Approved:

- 2. DR 1102710 – Construct Single-Family Dwelling on Montana Street - PUBLIC HEARING** to consider a request for Design Review approval to construct a new ±3,167 square foot single-family dwelling on a vacant lot located on Montana Street between Buena Vista and Nevada Avenue (APN: 556-141-002). SFR-3, Single-Family Low Density Residential Zoning District. Bulmare Gonzales, owner/applicant. Tentative Recommendation: Hold Over To 4/25/2007.
- 4. DR 1103450 – Review Design of Second Dwelling Unit on Ventura Street - PUBLIC HEARING** to consider a request for Design Review approval of an existing second dwelling unit built without prior design review located at 727 Ventura Street (APN: 523-053-009). SFR-3, Single-Family Low Density Residential Zoning District. Robert Onweller, owner/applicant. Tentative Recommendation: Conditional Approval.
- 6. DR 1103081 – Construct Two-Story Addition to Single-Family Dwelling on Chanslor Ave. - PUBLIC HEARING** to consider a request for Design Review approval to construct a ±1,884 square foot two-story addition to an existing single-family dwelling located at 2514 Chanslor Avenue (APN: 515-380-020). SFR-3, Single-Family Low Density Zoning District. Larry White, owner/applicant. Tentative Recommendation: Hold Over To 2/28/2007.
- 9. DR 1103610 – Demolish and Replace Existing Single-Family Residence on Cherry Street - PUBLIC HEARING** to consider a request for Design Review approval to demolish the existing residence and construct a new ±2,073 square foot one-story residence located at 1354 Cherry Street (APN: 561-261-025). SFR-3, Single-Family Low Density Residential Zoning District. Jose Serrano, owner/applicant. Tentative Recommendation: Conditional Approval.

Items Discussed:

- 1. DR 1103219 – Construct Two-Story Commercial Building on Washington Ave. - PUBLIC HEARING** to consider a request for Design Review approval to construct a ±4,900 square foot two-story commercial building on a vacant lot located at 146 Washington Avenue (APN: 558-140-008). C-1, Neighborhood Commercial Zoning District. Roberto Varriale, owner/applicant. Tentative Recommendation: Conditional Approval.

Chair Whitty announced the request, reopened the public hearing, and asked if there were questions of staff.

Boardmember Livingston confirmed a color board had been received. **Chair Whitty** noted the item had been reviewed previously by the DRB with recommendations and changes had been made to the original plan.

Roberto Varriale, owner/applicant, described changes as outlined in the staff report, Items 1-23.

Boardmember Smith questioned signage and Mr. Varriale said he did not know who would occupy the building and would return for Board or the Planning Director approval once tenants were in place.

Boardmember Livingston thanked the applicant for making the many changes, said the outcome of a plaster building with deep recessed windows will work well for the applicant and the City. He noted a multi-plex project was under construction behind the applicant's project, and there were drainage issues which would need to be dealt with by the applicant.

Boardmember Avellar felt a survey and proposed building plotted on the survey was required prior to submittal to the building department.

Vice Chair Woldemar noted there were solar panel devices on the roof and requested that if other mechanical equipment were located on the roof and because there are uphill buildings, that secondary screening be required of the applicant, and Mr. Thompson asked that the Board condition the request in their final motion.

Vice Chair Woldemar felt the proposed signage was minimal, said signage proposed would need to adhere to the City's sign regulations which he briefly discussed, and asked the applicant to be prepared to write into his leases that signage was subject to review and approval of the Planning Department and the City's zoning ordinance.

Chair Whitty confirmed the applicant had little opportunity for landscaping; however, he proposed planting Bougenvia vines to grow up against the fence line and agreed to plant a street tree.

Boardmember Bloom questioned the thickness of plantings, noted vines did require more maintenance, confirmed there were no shrubs and minimal groundcover, and provided some suggestions on vine species for the applicant, such as a passion or trumpet vine which has more choices of color.

Boardmember Woodrow confirmed the items requiring change were made verbally at the previous meeting and also submitted in writing by Boardmember Livingston to the applicant. He questioned the proposed drainage plan, the request for a contour map of the lot which was not needed due to the lot being graded and flat, and questioned the type of tenant for the building and parking of cars.

Boardmember Livingston referred to Sheet A6 and said the cornice was returning on both sides yet on the front elevation, the cornice was not returning on both sides. He confirmed with the applicant that the front cornice shall be returned at the corners and that he would also provide a good neighbor fence along the property line.

There were no public comments, and the public hearing was closed.

ACTION: It was M/S (Whitty/Avellar) to approve DR 1103219 based on staff's 4 findings, based on staff's 7 conditions, with the following additional conditions: 8) that the front cornice shall be returned on both sides; 9) a good neighbor fence will be built along the walkway; 10) any potential future roof equipment shall have secondary screening; 11) that the structure would be approved based on the zoning ordinance; 12) include the two findings of the Historic Structures Code; unanimously approved.

3. **DR 1103580 – Construct Residential Duplex on 17th Street** - PUBLIC HEARING to consider a request for Design Review approval to construct a new ±2,729 square foot residential duplex located at 640 – 17th Street (APN: 514-290-036). MFR-1, Multi-Family Residential Zoning District. Carlos Guerrero, owner/applicant. Tentative Recommendation: Conditional Approval.

Chair Whitty announced the request, opened the public hearing, and asked if there were questions of staff.

Boardmember Smith questioned whether comments were received from the Belding-Woods Neighborhood Council.

Carlos Guerrero, owner/applicant, made a brief presentation of the item, discussed covered and uncovered parking configurations, said driveways would be made of concrete and described the entrance.

Boardmember Woodrow felt the plan worked well and thanked the applicant.

Boardmember Bloom questioned the landscape plan, noted missing were plant names, questioned specific references on the plan, and Mr. Guerrero described the landscape plans. She recommended eliminating planting a grass strip on the side and confirmed the refuse cans would be located and identified on the plans.

Boardmember Avellar confirmed the proposal would have good neighbor fencing. He suggested the applicant use a white picket fence versus a cyclone fence.

Vice Chair Woldemar referred to the site plan, confirmed with the applicant that width of the lot was legally 37.9 feet and noted the building department would require a survey. He felt if area needed to be made up, it could be made up in the side yards, which only needed to be 10% of the lot width, or 3'7.5". In addition, each of the units would have 3 large garbage bins and very little room will be left in the side yard. He proposed a condition that would require one or both of the side yards have concrete in order to get to the back yard to place the refuse bins out of public view.

He asked the applicant to find a way to minimize the concrete and maximize landscaping, and recommended the concrete be made decorative. Regarding front yard fencing, he questioned why pilasters and a wrought iron picket fence was proposed. Regarding exterior elevations, there was a mix of roofs and he suggested using hip roofs for front and back. He said there were nice 22 foot backyards, but no where to get to them. He suggested the ground floor units have sliding glass doors to lead to the backyard, with a roof cover over the back doors. Regarding garage #2, he thought it would be nice to go through the garage to the backyard and suggested a door be added.

Boardmember Livingston noted his comments were similar to Vice Chair Woldemar's and asked for a sand finish for the stucco texture.

Vice Chair Woldemar felt the Board could request a more detailed landscape plan to return to the Board.

Chair Whitty referred the sidewalk leading to the front door; on one side there is a strip and the other is a garage wall. She asked to remove the strip and widen the garden along the garage wall, and plant vines along garage #2. She confirmed the applicant was amenable to returning to the Board with a revised landscape plan.

Public Comments:

A.J. Jellani, Acting President, Belding-Woods Neighborhood Council, provided the address and phone number to the Neighborhood Council as: PO Box 2305, Richmond, CA 94801; 510-237-6628. He said he did not have a chance to review the applicant's proposal, noted their neighborhood was made up of single family dwelling units, said they are impacted by water, roads and the sewer system due to the unlimited growth of the area, and asked the Board to allow their board to digest the project and hear it. He said they meet every fourth Tuesday of the month, except for December or February.

Vice Chair Woldemar confirmed with staff that the Board was meeting late in February and the second Wednesday in March and noted the owner has a right to build on the lot.

Chair Whitty confirmed staff did not receive a color board, and Mr. Guerrero said he did not have colors chosen as of yet. **Vice Chair Woldemar** confirmed the applicant did not make contact with the neighborhood council, which he noted was a requirement on the signed application.

ACTION: It was M/S (Woldemar/Smith) to continue DR 1135080 to March 14, 2007 in order for the applicant to make revisions to the plans, that the applicant take the revised plan to the neighborhood council for their February meeting, and return the revisions to staff in time for the March 14th meeting on the Consent Calendar, with the following additional revisions: That the applicant provide decorative pavement for driveways and walkways; consider creating more planting space between the pedestrian walkway and garage #2; make a distinction between the two pavements in that area; identify how the refuse containers would be handled for each of the two units by putting them in the rear yard and pave the side yard; be clear about the fencing both on the property lines; side yards and rear yard; consider changing the type of fencing in the front yard; confirm the width of the property by way of a title report; put a man door on the side of garage #2 for access to the side yard; provide for at least one or both ground floor bedrooms to have rear yard access and that doors have a roof cover for protection; that the project should have a hip roof solution throughout the entire roof plan; that there be a sand finish stucco texture for the entire project; that the applicant bring a colored drawing of the project illustrating the colors proposed and a sample materials board; that gates be provided on each side of the house to protect against rear yard access, that the side yard veneer go back as far as wherever the gate is; and that a more complete and specific landscape plan be provided, discouraging lawn, and identifying all plant materials and quantities; unanimously approved.

5. DR 1103589 – Construct Two-Story Addition to Single-Family Dwelling on Gertrude Ave. - PUBLIC HEARING to consider a request for Design Review approval to construct a ±1,104 square foot two-story addition to an existing single-family dwelling located at 407 Gertrude Avenue (APN: 561-181-026). SFR-3, Single-Family Low Density Zoning District. Rafael Castaneda, owner/applicant. Tentative Recommendation: Conditional Approval .

Chair Whitty announced the request, opened the public hearing, and noted the item was requested for removal from the Consent Calendar by Boardmember Livingston.

Boardmember Livingston confirmed with Brenda Munos, designer, that the house would be completely re-roofed, noted the posts were small compared to the roof and he asked they be made at least 6"x6", he asked that a header be added and match the building, confirmed new stucco would be used for the entire façade, and the porch would remain as is.

The public hearing was closed.

ACTION: It was M/S (Livingston/Smith) to approve DR 1103589 based on staff's recommended four findings, staff's recommended conditions 1-10, with the additional condition that 11) the 4"x6" post be changed to 6"x6" posts; 12) that there shall be a header indicated to match the header above the side entry; unanimously approved.

7. DR 1103620 – Construct Two-Story Addition to Single-Family Residence on Cutting Blvd. - PUBLIC HEARING to consider a request for Design Review approval to construct a ±1,923 square foot two-story addition to an existing single-family residence located at 2729 Cutting Blvd. (APN: 549-081-010). Residential Medium Density (Knox Cutting Specific Plan) Zoning District. Jose Castillo, owner; Daniela DiNucci, applicant. Tentative Recommendation: Conditional Approval.

Chair Whitty announced the proposal, opened the public hearing, and noted the item was requested for removal from the Consent Calendar by a member of the public.

Boardmember Livingston referred to the building's size and large architectural elements and felt its mass was out of proportion with other homes in the area. He sketched out a finer grain exterior and shared it with the Board.

Daniela DiNucci, applicant, said the owner wants to maintain the shape of the interior, and **Boardmember Livingston** suggested reducing the playroom's length.

Public Comments:

Tanya Boyce, President of the Cotez Neighborhood Council, said the council was now active, they meet at the new community center on Easter Hill and she invited the applicants to their next February 15th meeting. She requested the window trim type and size be called out, requested a condition for street trees, and requested inclusion of roof vents and gutters.

Chair Whitty said since the proposal was an addition to an existing building, she asked whether the applicant was required to submit a landscape plan, and Mr. Thompson said staff can look into the value of the improvements and determine if the trigger point was exceeded or not. He noted Public Works could also install a street tree at no charge.

Boardmember Bloom confirmed with Ms. DiNucci there were some existing plants on the property and said she received suggestions from Lena Velasco and would improve landscaping by making the lawn smaller and making shrub bed larger.

Chair Whitty confirmed with the owner the trash bins were located in the rear of the house, and she suggested a concrete pad be installed leading to the rear. She confirmed there would be 3-6 foot fencing around the entire property.

Vice Chair Woldemar suggested that the item be continued due to the number of changes to be made, and the applicant was amenable to returning with revisions.

Boardmember Smith did not support the solid fence and **Vice Chair Woldemar** suggested it be redone or at least reduced down to the code requirement for the height.

ACTION: It was M/S (Livingston/Whitty) to continue DR 1103620 to the March 14, 2007 meeting and direct the applicant to address the garbage bins, complete a landscape plan and meet with Boardmember Bloom, consider revising the roof design per his sketch,

consider revising the plans to call out all materials such as gutters, downspouts and roof vents, and fencing; unanimously approved.

8. DR 1103590 – Rehabilitate Historic Winter’s Building on 11th Street - PUBLIC HEARING to consider a request for Design Review approval to rehabilitate the exterior ground level façade of the historic Winter’s Building located at 339 – 11th Street (APN: 540-091-011). The rehabilitation will include the repair and, in some cases, the replication of missing ornamental plaster work and storefronts. Retail/Office/Institutional (City Center Specific Plan) Zoning District. Richmond Community Redevelopment Agency, owner; East Bay Center for the Performing Arts, applicant.

Chair Whitty announced the proposal, noted the item was requested for removal from the Consent Calendar by Boardmember Livingston, and opened the public hearing.

Lena Velasco said Planning staff and Redevelopment staff met with the applicant to address design changes, said the Macdonald Avenue elevation pattern of the framing for the storefronts was reconfigured, they also had Michael Holbert, a preservation architect and a consultant confirm the project was still within historic standards.

Boardmember Livingston said he liked the Planning Director’s sketch, said he was relieved that the scale of the storefront has been reduced vastly, felt the storefront system would have cost a lot just to cover old stucco, said he was still not happy with the Macdonald elevation and created a sketch of what he thought should be there, felt glass and aluminum should not be used, and more work was needed on the design.

Vice Chair Woldemar congratulated everyone for trying to reproduce the old drawings, liked the yellow paper version, liked the east elevation, center and right hand side of the elevation, felt the corner still was not quite right and did not support fake transom windows, questioned the storefront display cases behind the windows, asked the applicant to comment on what was being done, and he shared Boardmember Livingston’s concerns, as this was the fourth major project on the lower part of Macdonald and it warranted more attention.

Alan Wolken, Richmond Community Redevelopment Agency, asked the project architect to walk the Board through the project. He felt a lot of thought and effort went into the project, said they were doing an \$80 million project across the street, a streetscape improvement program in front of the building which would widen the sidewalk and position parking, have been working with East Bay Center for the Performing Arts for a number of years, moving tenants out of the building, and now they were in the entire building.

He said Jordan Simmons, representative from the East Bay Center for Performing Arts, Mark Cavanarro, project architect, and Mark Holbert, preservation architect, were present to further discuss the improvements. He said there was dewatering and intrusion issues in the basement, they wanted to ensure the improvements met with the Secretary of Interior standards, and they were not trying to cut corners and they want the building to be a jewel on Macdonald Avenue.

Mark Cavanarro, project architect, gave a presentation on major renovation work, limitations of design given historic standards and building codes, display windows and solutions for seismic conditions, and the possibility of transformation of the building for future use by a multiple tenant while still maintaining historic standards.

Boardmember Livingston felt his concern was the idea that there was aluminum and glass at the bottom and the way the ground floor was being treated. He did not think the response was the only one that met the historic standards and felt something reflective of the building but not

competing with the building was also another solution.

Chair Whitty felt the concern of the Board was that the building was too modern and needed a more textured look.

Vice Chair Woldemar asked for the reason how seismic aspects were addressed, and Mr. Cavanarro said the old concrete was very brittle, steel is too flexible, and compounding this was the height. The structural engineer was very adamant about their determination that a steel frame would not be strong enough and would not act with the concrete

Vice Chair Woldemar requested the applicant distinguish the three different glazing tones of the soft transom windows, and Mr. Cavanarro said they elected to do this because the light glass would let light in and confirmed that over time, computer images and displays could be utilized which would be very interesting.

Vice Chair Woldemar questioned a set of entry doors and confirmed they were made of pure glass. He also questioned the composition of display lights and how it was centered in the storefront.

EXTEND MEETING

| |
|--|
| ACTION: It was M/S (Woldemar/Livingston) to extend the meeting to 10:00 p.m.; unanimously approved. |
|--|

Boardmember Bloom voiced concern that the upper façade was beautiful and well proportioned and the lower portion was not, and suggested doing an odd shape at the bottom to improve the design and allow it to hang with the top façade, and she presented a drawing. She felt it would be fabulous to have an outdoor marquee band to announce events which could be done in a historic design.

Michael Holbert, preservation architect, said he was asked to evaluate the project, write the history of the building, strengthen the remaining historic fabric, and he briefly described it. He noted the building originally started out as a schizophrenic building which was historically inappropriate to overcome, noted building bases change over time which is recognized by the Secretary of the Interior standards, and in the process there has been an attempt to create a base that immediately reflects the building's time and place.

He felt it would change again in the future and there were multiple ways to meet standards, but one way not to meet them was by doing a false historicist approach, which was similar to Boardmember Livingston's drawing.

Regarding the replicated transoms, he said the original scheme was different than that shown tonight, it was more rigorous and a compromise and felt there would be no meaning in replicating them, as they were for a floral shop and for a music business gone by 1938.

Regarding vertical elements, he felt the building top should not be carried all the way down because it did not happen in the past and it was a two-part building and treated that way.

Vice Chair Woldemar said a letter was received from Chair Charles Duncan of the Historic Preservation Advisory Committee, and the committee recommended the architect look at the order and pattern of window subdivisions on the Macdonald Avenue elevation to more accurately reflect the order and spacing of the historic elements of the upper floors, and this was exactly what the DRB was asking for.

Vice Chair Woldemar questioned whether it was true or not that within the guidelines and rules from the Department of Interior that while you are not to replicate the historic aspect of things, there was nothing inappropriate in the rules about the proportions and shapes brought forward in the historic side of the building. He felt the base had a rhythm to it in mirrored columns, and he wondered why this framework could not be used as a basis, with some being solid because there must be sheer walls behind them. Mr. Holbert felt there were ways of executing this, flexibility and a lot of common ground. He said the standards strongly enforce what is old and what is new, and most important from his perspective is to reinforce what is old about the building.

Boardmember Livingston noted the columns do line up on the old plans, and he felt the Board was trying to steer the project into some order, felt the building has tremendous order to it, and felt the bottom goes into chaos and does not reflect any of the building's order and Mr. Holbert acknowledged it was possible to resolve the historic order.

Vice Chair Woldemar felt every suggestion made by the Board has been received in a less than enthusiastic comment, and asked for guidance from staff. Mr. Wolken said years ago the City had a façade improvement program in downtown Richmond, the local architect came up with a façade for the East Bay Center for the Performing Arts and the whole block, and he showed the second and third floors brought down to the ground and staff loved it. The Agency did not move forward with that program for a variety of reasons, but it also did not look at the interior or historical aspects of the building. They have been working with the center representatives in dealing with water and mold issues in the building and then they started seeing some elevations coming in and staff had the same comments. He felt the architect has been listening, there has been give and take, and staff has acknowledged limitations of what can be done while keeping with historic parameters, felt the architect would make some changes and some areas might also need to be maintained as recommended by the architect, as they have been thought through, and staff has been trying to address the same concerns as the Board.

Jordan Simmons, said he was a student when the center opened in 1968, said he was proud of Richmond and has been teaching at the center since 1978, discussed problems with the building and their efforts in making the building safe. He felt the problems have been addressed with the best usage of the structural rehabilitation, and they have worked hard to come up with the scheme of metal, colored glass and different textures in order to reflect the improvisation of rhythm and something that would be alive for the young, and asked the Board to allow them to proceed in order to bring forth ideas as discussed tonight.

Boardmember Avellar referred to the entry being on the side or front and Mr. Holbert noted there was a store entrance in the front, but the side entrance is the historic entrance into the upper floors.

Mr. Holbert further discussed the extensive revisions to plans, changes made to the project from its initial existence, and extensive work with staff.

Planning Director Richard Mitchell noted there was a deadline and suggested the Board come to a decision tonight, felt there were conditions that could be added that had to do with refinement, and felt the recommendation tonight would be for approval in order to proceed and then a discussion could be returned on what would be done behind the glass.

Chair Whitty noted there were a number of drawings and there were varying opinions of the Board.

Vice Chair Woldemar felt there was consensus of the Board that there is a need to bring some of the vertical elements of the upper floors to the ground, there is a piece of history that did this, appreciated the idea of trying to bring the art part into the corner of the building, said he was amazed that no one has discussed graphics on the Macdonald Avenue frontage and suggested the marquee idea, felt it was unfortunate the seismic work must be done a certain way and therefore the penetrations to the inside of the building were less, and wanted to hold the item over, be able to share sketches of the Board, and suggested holding a subcommittee meeting to discuss revisions again.

Boardmember Avellar felt engineers had a large impact on the architecture and felt they should participate in meetings.

Chair Whitty suggested a subcommittee meet and the Board meet again on February 28th. **Vice Chair Woldemar** noted they would get complete design drawings on the Civic Center and design review information next week and voiced concern about the amount of time he could spend on the subcommittee.

Boardmember Livingston and **Boardmember Avellar** agreed to volunteer to meet as a subcommittee and work together with the applicant.

Alan Wolken noted the East Bay Center for Performing Arts are working with their funders and voiced concern that if the project was delayed, state funding would go away, and Lena Velasco said staff needs to send the categorical exemption to the California Historic Endowment Fund, and confirmed with the Board that the findings could be made without necessarily making the findings having to do with historic structure code findings. City Attorney Privat confirmed the CEQA action was legal to take.

ACTION: It was M/S (Woldemar/Avellar) to approve the Categorical Exemption per CEQA guidelines Section 15331, Class 31, under the Historical Resource Restoration/Rehabilitation section for the project based on the staff's recommended two historic structures code findings and the staff statements therein; unanimously approved.

ACTION: It was M/S (Woldemar/Avellar) to table the item to February 28, 2007; unanimously approved.

Chair Whitty noted there was a 10-day appeal period on the CEQA action and confirmed with the subcommittee they would meet on Wednesday, February 7, 2007 at 5:00 p.m.

EXTEND MEETING

ACTION: It was M/S (Woldemar/Livingston) to extend the meeting to 10:30 p.m.; unanimously approved.

10. 9900011 – Proposed Green Principles and Conditions - INFORMATIONAL ITEM to review draft standard Green Building conditions and requirements for large scale commercial and City sponsored building projects.

Joe Light noted standard building practices of the last two decades have paid very little heed to the health of its workers and inhabitants and to the environmental consequences of buildings. He noted green building was starting to move through the mainstream, he said many projects to be reviewed by the City already meet or attempt to meet the standards staff is suggesting for adoption.

He discussed City training recently held on Green Building, said conditions were contained in the Board packet which were developed in part by staff about three years ago absent of an official green building program, and staff recommended that rather than approving all conditions which may restrict certain development, the City move forward with a green building ordinance, which has been approved by many Bay Area cities.

He further discussed requirements for commercial buildings and city projects and recommended the City pursue adoption of a green building ordinance.

Public Forum – Brown Act - None

BOARD BUSINESS

11. Reports of Officers, Board Members, and Staff - None

The meeting was adjourned at 10:30 p.m.